

# Journeys to the Eleusinian Mysteries (with an Appendix on the Procession at the Andanian Mysteries)

*Kevin Clinton*

The journey of initiates to Attica and their subsequent participation in the procession to Eleusis at the Mysteries is the subject of three sacred laws. The first is an Athenian law dated by letter style to c. 470-460 BC, now in the British Museum – in fact, it is an Elgin Marble. It has the shape of a pillar, broken on top and inscribed on all four sides. The side that is now called Side B contains the information about the initiates' journey; it calls for a truce that will be in effect for foreigners and Athenians:

## 1. *IEleusis* 19.B (IG I<sup>3</sup>, 6.B)

|    |                     |    |                   |
|----|---------------------|----|-------------------|
|    | [ι·σ]πονδάς εἶν-    |    | ας δὲ σπονδάς     |
|    | [αι] τοῖσι μύστ-    |    | εἶναι ἐν τέισ-    |
| 10 | [εσιν] καὶ το[ῖς]   | 30 | ι πόλεσιν ἡ[σ]-   |
|    | [ἐπ]όπτεισιν [κ]-   |    | αι χρῶνται τῶ-    |
|    | [αἰ τ]οῖς ἀκολ[ο]-  |    | ι ἱερῶι καὶ Ἀ-    |
|    | [ύθ]οισιν καὶ [χ]-  |    | θηναίοισιν ἐ-     |
|    | [ρέ]μασιν τῶν [ὀ]-  |    | κεῖ ἐν τέισιν     |
| 15 | [θ]νείον καὶ [Ἀθ]-  | 35 | αὐτέσι πόλεσ-     |
|    | [ε]ν[α]ίοισιν [h]ά- |    | ιν· τοῖσι δὲ ὀλ-  |
|    | πασιν· ἄρχε[ν] δ-   |    | εἰζοσι μυστε-     |
|    | ἐ τὸν χρόν[ο]ν τ-   |    | ρίοισιν τὰς [σ]-  |
|    | ὄν σπονδῶν [τ]ῷ     |    | πονδάς εἶνα[ι]    |
| 20 | Μεταγεινιῶ-         | 40 | τῷ Γαμελιῶνο-     |
|    | νος μενὸς ἀπ[ὸ]     |    | ς μενὸς ἀπὸ δ[ι]- |
|    | διχομενίας [κ]-     |    | [χ]ομενίας κα[ι]  |
|    | αἱ τὸν Βοεδρ[ο]-    |    | τὸν Ἀνθεστέ[ρ]-   |
|    | μιῶνα καὶ τῷ [Π]-   |    | [ι]ῶνα καὶ τῷ Ἐλ- |
| 25 | υανοφιδίονος        | 45 | αφεβολιδίονος     |
|    | μέχρι δεκάτε-       |    | μέχρι δεκάτε-     |
|    | ς ἡσταμένο· τ-      |    | ς ἡσταμένο.       |
|    |                     |    | <i>vacat</i>      |

“Let there be a truce [σπονδαί] for *mystai*, *epoptai*, servants, baggage of the foreigners, and all Athenians.”<sup>1</sup> The truce is to be in effect from the middle of Metageitnion, i.e. a month before the start of the Mysteries, until the tenth of Pyanopsion, i.e. about fifteen days after the end of the festival. It is further specified that the truce is to be valid in the cities that make use of the sanctuary and for Athenians in the same cities. Thus it is not necessarily a Panhellenic truce, but those cities “that make use of the sanctuary” would at least include a broad area of central Greece. It seems to imply that there were agreements or understandings between the various cities and Athens concerning use of the sanctuary. Significant here is the control by Athens: first, the sanctuary is at Eleusis, but Athens controls the access to it (this is especially clear in the regulations on Side A, which provide for exclusion of a city from the sanctuary for improper behavior); second, although not mentioned here, the initiates do not go directly to Eleusis, but to central Athens, the *asty*, from where the procession continues the journey to Eleusis.

Descriptions of processions during the Mysteries are provided by two other sacred laws. These processions include the procession of the sacred objects from Eleusis to the City Eleusinion before the start of the festival and processions to Eleusis during the festival. A decree of the early 3rd century of our era presents a problem concerning the date of the

1 On the *spondai*, see *IEleusis* 2:19 (Commentary).

procession to Eleusis with the sacred objects, which it declares to be Boedromion 19 (lines 18-22):

## 2. *IEleusis* 638 (= *IG II<sup>2</sup>*, 1078) c. AD 220

ἔδοξεν τ[ῶ]ι δήμωι· Ἀραβιαν[ὸς ἦρχεν . . . c.8 . . . ἐπρυ]-  
[τάνευε]ν· Εὐτυχὸς ἐγραμ[μάτευεν . . . c.11 . . . ἐπε]-  
[σάται]· Δρυαντιανὸς ἄρχων [τῶν Εὐμολπιδῶν εἶπεν]·  
[ἐπει]δὴ καὶ διατελοῦμε[ν ἐν τοῖς νῦν καθάπερ] καὶ  
[δ]ιὰ τῶν παρωχημένων [χρόνων τελοῦντες τὰ μυ]στήρι- 5  
α, καὶ τὰ πάτρια προστάτ[τει τῶι γένει τῶν Εὐμολπιδῶν  
πεφροντικένοι ὅπως ἂν [ἐν κόσμωι ἀχθ]εῖν τὰ ἱερὰ  
δεῦρο τ' ἐκ τῆς Ἐλευσεῖνος καὶ πάλιν ἐκ τοῦ ἅστεως Ἐ-  
λευσεῖνάδε, ἀγαθῇ τύχ[ῃ] δεδόχθαι] τῶι δήμωι προσ-  
τάξει τῶι κοσμητῇ τῶν [ἐφήβων κ]ατὰ τὰ ἀρχαῖα νόμι- 10  
μα [ἄ]γειν Ἐλευσεῖνάδε τοῦ[ς ἐφήβ]ους τῇ τρίτῃ ἐπὶ δέ-  
[κα] τοῦ Βοηδρομιῶνος με[τὰ τοῦ] εἰθισμένου σχήμα-  
[τος] τῆς ἅμα ἱεροῖς πομπ[ῆς, ἵ]να τῇ τετράδι ἐπὶ δέκα πα-  
[ραπ]έμψωσιν τὰ ἱερὰ μέχ[ρ]ι τοῦ Ἐλευσινίου τοῦ ὑπὸ  
[τῇ] πόλει, ὥς ἂν κόσμος [τ]ε πλείων καὶ φρουρὰ μείζων 15  
[περὶ] τὰ ἱερὰ ὑπάρχ[ο]ι, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ὁ φαιδυντὴς τοῖν θε-  
[οῖν] ἀγγέλλει κατὰ τὰ πάτρια τῇ ἱερεΐᾳ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ὡς  
[ἦκει] τὰ ἱερὰ κ[αὶ] ἡ παραπέμπουσα στρατιά, κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ  
[δὲ] τῇ ἐνάτῃ ἐπὶ δέκα τοῦ Βοηδρομιῶνος προσ-  
[τάξει] τῶι κοσμητῇ τῶν ἐφήβων ἄγειν τοὺς ἐφή[βους] 20  
[πάλιν] Ἐλευσεῖνάδε μετὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ σχήματος π[αραπέμ]-  
[πο]ντας τὰ ἱερὰ. μέλιν δὲ τούτου τῶι κατ' ἐν[ιαυτὸν]  
κοσμητῇ, ὅπως μηδέποτε τοῦτο ἐκλε[ιφθεῖ]ν μη-  
δὲ ὀλιγορηθεῖν ποτὲ τὰ τῆς εὐσεβείας [τῆς πρὸς τῷ θε]-  
ῶ. παραπέμπειν δὲ τοὺς ἐφήβους π[άντας, ἔχοντας] 25  
τὴν πανοπλίαν, ἐστεφανωμέν[ους μυρρίνης στεφά]-  
νωι, βαδεῖζοντας ἐν τάξει. ἐπ[εὶ] δ[ὲ] προστάττομεν τοῖς ἐ-  
φήβοις τὴν τοσαύτην ὁδοιπορήσαι π[ομπήν, δίκαιον αὐτοὺς]  
καὶ θυσιῶν καὶ σπονδῶν καὶ παιάνων τῶ[ν κατὰ τὴν]  
ὁδὸν μεθέξειν, ὡς ἂν τὰ τε ἱερὰ μετὰ φρουρᾶ[ς ἰσχυρο]- 30  
τέρας καὶ πομπῆς μακροτέρας ἄγοιτο, οἱ τε ἔφ[η]βοι  
παρακολουθοῦντες τῇ περὶ τὸ θεῖον τῆς πόλεω[ς]  
θεραπείαι καὶ ἄνδρες εὐσεβέστεροι γείνοιτο. μεθέ-  
ξουσιν δ[ὲ] καὶ οἱ ἔφ[η]βοι πάντες τῶν τε ἄλλων ὧν ἂν  
παρέχ[η] τ[ῇ] τοῖς Εὐμολπίδαις ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ γένους, καὶ τῇ[ς] 35  
δι[αν]ομῆς. γενέσθαι δὲ τὴν γνώμην ταύτην φα[νερ]-  
ᾶν καὶ τῇ ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλῇ καὶ τῇ βουλ[ῇ] τῶν  
Φ ν καὶ τῶι ἱεροφάντῃ καὶ τῶι γένει τῶν Εὐ[μολπιδῶν].  
ἀναγράψαι δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα τοῦτο τὸν [τα]μία[ν] τοῦ γέ-  
νους τῶν Εὐμολπιδῶν ἐν τρισὶν [στή]λαις καὶ στήσαι 40  
τὴν μὲν ἐν Ἐλευσινίῳ τῶι ὑπὸ [τῇ] πόλει, τὴν δὲ ἐν  
τῶι Διογενείῳ, τὴν δὲ ἐν Ἐλευσεῖνι ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι πρὸ  
τοῦ βου[λ]ευτηρίου.

Plutarch, on the other hand, attests that the Athenians "lead out Iakchos", the divine leader of the initiates, on Boedromion 20: "περὶ αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκάδα τοῦ Βοηδρομιῶνος ἢ τὸν μυστικὸν Ἰακχὸν ἐξάγουσιν" (*Vit. Cam.* 19.10); "εἰκάδι γὰρ ἡ φρουρὰ Βοηδρομιῶνος εἰσήχθη μυστηρίων ὄντων, ἢ τὸν Ἰακχὸν ἐξ ἁστεος Ἐλευσινάδε πέμπουσιν" (*Vit. Phoc.* 28.2-3). Furthermore, the chorus in Euripides' *Ion*, in its lyric description of the great Reception of Iakchos, which took place as the initiates arrived at the sanctuary,<sup>2</sup> alludes to the 20th as the day of the event (*Eur. Ion* 1074-86 [cf. *Schol. Ar. Ran.* 314]).<sup>3</sup> It is clear from *Ar. Ran.* 313-53, *Eur. Ion.*, and especially *Hdt.* 8.65 that the initiates accompanied Iakchos in this procession while they sang the "Iakchos song".<sup>4</sup> It is surprising, then, that for such a well-known procession we have two contradictory dates, from two authoritative sources, Plutarch and the decree. The key to the solution lies in the fact that in the decree there is not a word about initiates (*mystai*) or Iakchos; this decree describes only an escort (*pompe*) of the sacred objects (*hiera*); it refers to the procession as the *pompe hama hierois*. The solution, as I argued in 1988, following a suggestion by John Mansfield, must be that there were two processions, an Escort with Sacred Objects, which

2 The Epimeletai of the Mysteries were in charge of the reception: "ἐπεμελήθησαν δὲ καὶ τῆς ἁλαδὲ ἐλάσε[ως] καὶ τῆς Ἐλευσίνι τοῦ Ἰακχοῦ ὑποδοχῆς" (*IEleusis* 208.20-1 = *IG II<sup>3</sup>*, 1.1164).

3 "αἰσχύνομαι τὸν πολὺν μὲν θεόν, εἰ παρὰ Καλλιχόροισι παγαῖς λαμπάδα θεωρὸς εἰκάδων ἐννύχιον ἄνυσεν ὄψεται, ὅτε καὶ Διὸς ἀστερωπὸς ἀνεχόρουσεν αἰθήρ, χορεύει δὲ σελάνα καὶ πεντήκοντα κόραι Ἰηρέας αἱ κατὰ πόντον ἀεναῶν τε ποταμῶν δῖνας χορεύόμεναι τὰν χρυσοστέφανον κόραν καὶ ματέρα σεμνάν." *Schol. Ar. Ran.* 323a (Chantry): "μία τῶν μυστηρίων ἡ εἰκάς ἐστιν, ἐν ἣ τὸν Ἰακχὸν ἐξάγουσι."

4 *Hdt.* 8.65: "ἰδεῖν δὲ κονιορτὸν χωρέοντα ἀπ' Ἐλευσίνος ὡς ἀνδρῶν μάλιστα κη τρισμυρίων, ἀποθωμάζειν τέ σφας τὸν κονιορτὸν ὅτε ἂν κοτε εἴη ἀνθρώπων, καὶ πρόκατε φωνῆς ἀκούειν, καὶ οἱ φαίνεσθαι τὴν φωνὴν εἶναι τὸν μυστικὸν Ἰακχόν."



set out on the 19th, and a procession leading out Iakchos on the 20th.<sup>5</sup>

Another solution, proposed in the 19th century and followed by many scholars since then, is that the initiates set out on the morning of the 19th, but that their arrival at Eleusis in the evening actually occurred on the 20th, according to the Athenian reckoning of the evening as the start of the new day.<sup>6</sup> However, the evidence that the Athenians began their day in the evening as opposed to the morning is unconvincing. In any case, the literary sources and the sacred law date the procession by its *start*: Plutarch states that they lead out Iakchos on the 20th; the sacred law assigns the *pompe* to the 19th. The time of arrival in Eleusis is irrelevant; each procession starts on a different day. Another possible solution, which I do not believe has been proposed, might be that there was a change in the date of the procession between the Classical period and the early 3rd century AD. However, Plutarch uses the present tense – “the Athenians lead out Iakchos on the 20th of Boedromion” – so is clearly referring to the present time, approximately a hundred years before the decree. Most significantly, there has been no change in the date of the procession with Iakchos between the time of Euripides and that of Plutarch. Given the time-honoured status of this day of procession, it is highly unlikely that the decree from the early 3rd century AD would have changed it, especially in view of the fact that the decree is archaizing and bases its practice on *ta patria*, ancestral tradition (line 7) and “original customs” (“ἀρχαῖα νόμιμα”, line 11).<sup>7</sup> Thus the decree should refer to a different

procession, the “Escort with the *Hiera*”, as it says, and not the leading out of Iakchos.

In accordance with the Athenian practice of assigning each day of the Mysteries its own name, the 19th could have been called “πομπή ἅμα ἱεροῖς”, whereas the day on which they lead out Iakchos was called “Ἰακχος” according to Hesychius.<sup>8</sup>

Let us look more closely at the text of the decree:

Dryantianos, archon [of the Eumolpidae proposed]: since we continue celebrating the Mysteries in the present as in past times, and ancestral tradition commands [the *genos* of the Eumolpidae] to see to it that the sacred objects be conducted both hither from Eleusis and again to Eleusis from the *asty*....

Dryantianos was a member of the *genos* of the Eumolpidae, and so the restoration that he was the archon is highly likely.<sup>9</sup> The fact that the proposer was the archon of this *genos*, that the hierophant and the *genos* were informed of the decision of the decree (line 38), and that the treasurer of the Eumolpidae had the decree inscribed on three *stelai* (lines 39–40) strongly supports the restoration of the *genos* in line 6, and makes clear that this ancestral custom, the Escort with the *Hiera*, was the province of the Eumolpidae and its leader, the hierophant. It is also clear that the *hiera* were normally kept in the sanctuary at Eleusis.<sup>10</sup>

Lines 9–21 present what is to be decreed:

the last known incumbent in the second quarter of the 2nd century AD (Clinton 1974, 96–7).

8 s.v. Ἰακχόν· τὸν Διόνυσον ASn. ἡ μίαν ἡμέραν τῶν μυστηρίων, ἐν ᾗ τὸν Ἰακχόν ἐξάγουσι. καὶ ἡ ψῆδῃ, ἣν οἱ μεμνημένοι ἄδουσι· καὶ ἥρωσ, <οὐ> καὶ ναὸς ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ καὶ ἄγαλμα. τινὲς δὲ καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν Διόνυσον οὕτως ἔλεγον.”

9 See the stemma in Oliver 1949, 243–58 and the commentary in Aleshire 1991, 72 (with stemma, table 1).

10 This is also clear from the rescue of the *hiera* from the sanctuary as the Costoboci invaded (IEleusis 494.515–6).

5 Clinton 1988, 70.

6 Foucart 1914, 324–5.

7 That there was a procession with Iakchos at its head around this time is confirmed by the existence of the Iakchagogs priest, Flavius Iakchagogs Agryleus, archon at the end of the 2nd century or beginning of the 3rd century AD: IG II<sup>2</sup>, 3680 (= Agora XV, 453), 3732, with Follet 1976, 516. The use of hieronymy suggests an increase in prestige for the priesthood since the time of

For good fortune let it be decreed by the Demos to order the cosmēte of the ephebes in accordance with the original customs to conduct the ephebes to Eleusis on Boedromion 13 in the customary formation of the escort with the sacred objects, in order that on Boedromion 14 they escort the sacred objects to the Eleusinion below the Acropolis, so that greater *kosmos* and better protection be available for the sacred objects, when also the Phaidyntes of the Two Goddesses announces to the Priestess of Athena according to ancestral custom that the sacred objects and the military escort have arrived. And in the same way on Boedromion 19 to order the cosmēte of the ephebes to conduct the ephebes again to Eleusis in the same formation, as they escort the sacred objects....

On the 14th they escort the *hiera* c. 21 kilometres to the Eleusinion below the Acropolis – an exercise that healthy and disciplined 18- or 19-year-olds should be able to perform as a matter of course. Five days later, on the 19th, they set out again with the *hiera* on the 21 kilometre journey to Eleusis and, after taking part in various festivities along the way (sacrifices, libations, paeans), arrive at the sanctuary by the late afternoon or early evening. If they had to escort yet another procession to Eleusis, this time with Iakchos and the initiates, on the morning of the very next day, they would have to walk 21 kilometres back to central Athens from Eleusis on the evening of the 19th, arriving late at night, then early in the morning, presumably after little sleep, march 21 kilometres again to Eleusis, escorting Iakchos and the initiates. So it is not surprising that the decree says nothing about the ephebes performing an evening march to central Athens and another escort on the 20th for Iakchos and the initiates. Such an inhumane schedule would likely not have been demanded of the ephebes, especially since the decree acknowledges (lines 27-8) that they had already performed an “extensive escort” by the end of Boedromion 19.

The other possibility, adopted by many scholars, is that the procession escorted by the ephebes included Iakchos and the initiates on the 19th along with the *hiera*.<sup>11</sup> The decree, however, offers no support for an ephebic escort on Boedromion 19 which included Iakchos and the initiates. This would involve a change in the traditional date, Boedromion 20, of the Iakchos procession, i.e. the leading out of Iakchos; and surely it would be rather bizarre for such a decree as this one, which emphasizes that it is based on ancestral tradition, to serve as the announcement of such a change. Furthermore, it mentions in lines 27-8 that because of “such an extensive escort” on the 19th, the ephebes deserve certain privileges, namely participation in sacrifices, libations, and paeans along the route as well as privileges that the archon of the Eumolpidae provides, including the “distribution”, a sum of money.<sup>12</sup> Since these privileges are based on the ephebes’ services as escorts, it is surprising that an ephebic escort of Iakchos and the initiates, if it occurred at the same time, is not mentioned in this document as part of the ephebes’ meritorious work (“greater *kosmos* and stronger guard for the *hiera*” [15-6] and “a stronger guard and a more extensive escort” [30-1]).

Finally, a most critical omission concerns the song called the Iakchos song – a major feature of the Iakchos procession – yet the only songs in which the ephebes participate, according to the decree, are paeans. It is hard to imagine any reason why the ephebes would not participate in the Iakchos song if it was being sung, or even why the Iakchos song is not mentioned at all. Thus the absence of any reference at all to Iakchos (or the initiates) is astonishing, especially the absence of Iakchos as the star of this procession, leading the initiates on the way to Eleusis (described below and illustrated in paintings).<sup>13</sup>

11 See recently Parker 2005, 349 n. 91.

12 On the distribution, see Clinton 1974, 23.

13 Paintings: Clinton 1992, 64-75.



In the Late Hellenistic period, the ephebes had escort duties that were significantly less onerous than those required by this decree, as we learn from several Hellenistic decrees honouring ephebes. These decrees state that the ephebes met the *hiera* and escorted them, expressed by the formula “ἐποιήσαντο δὲ καὶ τὴν ὑπάντησιν τοῖς ἱεροῖς καὶ προέπεμψαν αὐτά, καὶ τὸν Ἰακχὸν ὡσαύτως” (e.g., IG II<sup>2</sup>, 1008.7): “they also performed the *hypantes* of the *hiera* and escorted them onward, and Iakchos likewise”. The adverb “likewise” indicates an action parallel to what they did for the *hiera*: they also performed the *hypantes* for Iakchos and escorted *him* onward.<sup>14</sup> There were two parallel actions; not a single procession, but separate ones.<sup>15</sup> No Hellenistic document reports that the ephebes went all the way to Eleusis to fetch the *hiera*. In fact, the *hypantes*, a meeting or formal reception, implies that they intercepted the sacred objects or Iakchos before the *hiera* or Iakchos reached a destination. In a common form of *hypantes*, a group of officials would go out of their city and meet a distinguished guest (or in some cases the entire citizen body would turn out) and escort the guest into the city.<sup>16</sup>

14 “ὡσαύτως” with reference to Iakchos also occurs in IG II<sup>2</sup>, 1028.9-10, 1030.6-7 (restored), SEG XXII, 111.6-7 (restored), XXIV, 189.5 (restored); alternatively, “ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ”, in IG II<sup>2</sup>, 1006.9, 74, 1011.8, SEG XXI, 476.6 (restored).

15 One decree tells us that these meetings took place at a site called “Echo” (IG II<sup>2</sup>, 1011.7-8). A suitable spot would be in the pass through Mt. Aigaleos, where now the sound of automobiles reverberates off the nearby hills, not far from the entry into the Thriasian Plain.

16 See the full description of a formal ὑπάντησις in a decree of Cyzicus when the city welcomed its benefactors, the kings Roimetalkes, Polemon, and Kotys and their mother in AD 39 (SIG<sup>3</sup>, 798.19-25). Another example, closer to the time of the ephebic decrees, is the Athenians’ welcome of Athenion (in 88/7) when he came from Mithradates to win the city over to the side of the king: “ὑπήντησαν δ’ αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον τεχνῖται, τὸν ἄγγελον τοῦ νέου Διονύσου καλοῦντες ἐπὶ τὴν κοινὴν ἐστίαν καὶ τὰς περὶ ταύτην εὐχὰς τε καὶ σπονδὰς” (Ath. 5.49, 212D).

Thus the ephebes would have met the *hiera* as the *hiera* were approaching the asty of Athens, and met Iakchos as he was approaching Eleusis. Iakchos did not need to approach Athens in a procession; he was already there, in his temple; the only time that the ephebes could meet him was when he approached Eleusis. The *hiera*, on the other hand, approached Athens on Boedromion 14. The ephebes must have been in central Athens on that day, as there is no mention of an escort from Eleusis in the Hellenistic decrees, and so we can assume that at that time they performed the *hypantes* and escort onward into the central city. But the question then arises: When did the ephebes go to Eleusis in order to perform the *hypantes* for Iakchos as he approached the deme? It seems to make the most sense to assume that they escorted the *hiera* on the 19th from Athens to Eleusis; in that case, the ephebes were already in Eleusis as Iakchos approached on the 20th. This also suits the language of the Hellenistic ephebic decrees: the *hypantes* and escort of the *hiera* always precedes that of Iakchos. Thus the ephebes’ *hypantes* on the 14th and escorts on the 14th and 19th precede their *hypantes* and escort of Iakchos on the 20th.<sup>17</sup> In mentioning that the ephebes performed the *hypantes* and escorted the *hiera* onward, the decree assumes that the reader will know that the escort onward had two parts – escorting the *hiera* to the City Eleusinion on the 14th and continuing the escort to Eleusis five days later, on the 19th. On the following day, the 20th, they did the same for Iakchos, coming out from Eleusis to meet him and escort him into Eleusis. The escort of Iakchos into Eleusis on the 20th was a relatively short trip, not a physically demanding one.<sup>18</sup>

17 Usually the decrees then mention that the ephebes lifted the oxen for sacrifice at Eleusis.

18 For further discussion of the two processions, including the interpretation of Graf 1996, 61-4, see *IEleusis* 2:638 (Commentary), 2:407-9.

The decree from the 3rd century AD (*IEleusis* 638) does not mention a *hypantesis* of Iakchos by the ephebes, presumably because their role as escorts of the *hiera* was complete after they had escorted the *hiera* to Eleusis. The Reception of Iakchos in Eleusis, which is attested at the end of the 3rd century BC (*IEleusis* 208 = *IG II<sup>3</sup>*, 1164) and which we know was taking place at least from the time of Euripides, may have been felt, in the early 3rd century AD (or even earlier), to be a sufficient welcome for Iakchos, so that a *hypantesis* was no longer necessary. It seems to be a reasonable hypothesis that the ephebic *hypanteseis* of the *hiera* and Iakchos were Hellenistic innovations and did not represent ancestral tradition, hence they were superseded by the scheme described in the archaizing sacred law from the early 3rd century AD. The original ancestral tradition, as

I will suggest shortly, was a full military escort for the *hiera*; this was relaxed in Hellenistic times by the introduction of the *hypanteseis*, but was fully reinstated by the late Roman decree (*IEleusis* 638).<sup>19</sup>

### 3. *IEleusis* 250 (= *LSS* 15)

This Hellenistic document (Agora Excavations, Inv. No. I 3844, published by James Oliver in 1941), though fragmentary, is our other main sacred law concerning a procession at the Mysteria. It gives us a glimpse of the complexities of organizing the great procession of Iakchos, consisting of thousands of initiates and other participants, as it made its way from the centre of Athens along the Sacred Way to Eleusis.

- 10 [- - - - -] ΟΓΙΔΙΣ ὑπάρχοντο[ς - - - - -]  
 [- - - - -] τοῦ δήμου· τύχη ἀγ[αθῇ] δεδόχθαι τῇ βουλῇ [- - - - -]  
 [- - - - -] ΙΕΙΑΛ[- - - - -]  
 [- -] ΔΕΙΑ[- - - -] ΝΑΠΟ[- - - - -]  
 [- - - - -] κατὰ τὰ π[ά]τρια τῶ[ν - - - - -]  
 15 [- - - -] ΕΙΑ[- κατὰ τὰ] π[ά]τρια καὶ [- - - - -]  
 [- - - - -] Ι[- - - -] Τ[- - - - -]  
 [- - - - -] κατὰ? φυλὰς πρὸ μυ[σ]τηρίων - - - - -  
 [- - - - -] ἐκάστη Ι[ . . . 7 . . . ] ΙΙΙ[ . . . ] Σ[ . . . ] ντ[- - - - -]  
 [- - - - -] τῶν μυσταγωγῶν ἐ[κ]κλησί[α] - - - - - οἱ πάρε[-  
 20 [δροι τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ οἱ ἐπιμεληταὶ τῶν μυστηρίων [- - - - -]  
 [- - - -] ως, λειτουργεῖτωσαν δὲ τοῖς τελο[υ]μένοις - - - - -  
 [ . . . . . οἱ ἱερεῖς οἱ τε δημόσιοι πάντες [κ]αὶ [- - - - -]  
 [ . . . . 9 . . . . Κ]ηρύκων καὶ Εὐμολπιδῶν [- - - - -]  
 [- - - -] τοὺς ἱκανοὺς καὶ [- - - - -] - ἐλαύ[-  
 25 [νειν δὲ κατὰ] τάξιν καὶ τὴν πορείαν εὐκό[σ]μως π[οι]εῖ[ν] ᾧστ[ε] ΑΤ[- - - - -]  
 [- - - -] ἐὰν δὲ οἱ μυσταγωγοὶ μὴ συνπ[ο]ρεύωνται τοῖς μύσταις - - - - -  
 [ . . . . πρὸ τοῦ τῆς] μνήσεως καιρ[ο]ῦ ἐξ[η]γῶντα[ι] τ[ο]ῖς μύστ[αι]ς - - - - -  
 [- - - -] ὅταν δὲ ἄγωσι τοὺς μύστας ἐπὶ . . . . - Ο[ . . . ] αν [- - -] μυστ[- - - - -]  
 [- - - -] καὶ οἱ τῶν μυστηρί[ω]ν ἐπιμεληταὶ κ[ύ]ριοι ἔστωσαν ζημ[ι]ῶσαι τὸν[ . . . . . ]  
 30 [- - - -] θαι παραχ[ρ]ῆμα ἐ[ν] τῶ[ι] . . . . 7-8 . . . . ΔΕΤΟΙ[- c.6 -] καὶ ἔνδε[ι]ξις ἔσ[-  
 [τω πρὸς τὸν βασιλέ]α τῶ βομλομένω οἷς ἐξ[ε]στι Αθηναίων - -] κα[ὶ] το[ῖ]ς ἐπιμεληταῖς[ . . . 7 . . . ]  
 [ . . . . τῶν μυστηρί]ων· τὸν δὲ ἐνδε[ι]χ[θ]έντα - - - -] εἰς ἕνα [καὶ] πεντακοσίους [ . . . . 10 . . . . ]  
 [κατὰ δὲ τὰς στ]ήλας[ . . . ] τε[ι]μάτω αὐτῶ ἢ [ἡ]λια[ . . . ] αἰ, τ[ῆ]ς χρῆ παθεῖν ἢ ἀ[π]ορτεῖσ[α]ν· τὰς δὲ πε[ρὶ] ἀσεβείας  
 [μυστηρίων λαγ]χανομένας δίκας εἰσαγέτωσ[α]ν οἱ ἐπιμεληταὶ τῶν [μυ]στηρίων πρώτα[ς] εἰς πάντα]

19 There may also have been a *hypantesis* by ordinary Athenians if Foucart 1914, 306 is correct in his interpretation of a passage in [Lys.] *Against Andocides* 50.





of the Escort of the *Hiera*. The *Iakchos* March was a joyous affair, with the *mystai* shouting “*Iakche*, *Iakche*” as they sing the *Iakchos* song – a march with Dionysiac enthusiasm.

The *mystai* in the *Frogs* generally see *Iakchos* as a fellow traveler (396), even an escort (408) as he sometimes appears in vase paintings.<sup>22</sup> But they are not his escort. In the actual *elasis*, as Plutarch says, “they [the Athenians] lead out *Iakchos*”, i.e. his statue is on a wagon, at the head of the procession, guided by the sacred official called *Iakchagogos*.<sup>23</sup> The chorus in the *Frogs* sing (350-2) “Illuminating with torchlight, lead out to flowering meadowland our youthful chorus, blessed one!” *Iakchos* is the focus and star of this procession of the *mystai*, whereas the focus of the *pompe hama hierois* on the 19th is the *hiera*, the sacred objects, most likely led by the hierophant. The *pompe hama hierois* featured a military escort enhancing the dignity and solemnity of the *hiera* while protecting them against the possibility of impiety (*IEleusis* 638).<sup>24</sup> The decree refers to the ephebes as “an escorting military force”, “*παραπέμπουσα στρατιά*” (line 19). If there is significance in this phrase, used in this archaizing document, which bases itself on ancestral tradition, I suspect that it is the fact that, early on, a military force guarded the *hiera* on the long journeys from Eleusis to the Eleusinion and from the Eleusinion to Eleusis, even before the formal institution of the ephebes, because the *hiera* needed to be protected against impiety, especially during times of hostilities. By the Late Hellenistic period, however, there was much less need for such a military escort from

Eleusis to the asty; by then, the *hypantes* was sufficient to honour the approaching *hiera*.

*IEleusis* 250 (above, pp. 166-7) mentions some of the officials who accompanied the initiates in the *Iakchos* procession: the *basileus* and the *epimeletai* of the *Mysteria* (lines 20, 29, 37, 43). They were administrators of the *Mysteria*, as we know from the *Athenaion Politeia* and a law of the 4th century BC (*IEleusis* 138).

The only Eleusinian sacred official explicitly mentioned in connection with the *pompe hama hierois* is the *phaidyntes*, but the famous Bridge Decree of 422 BC (*IG I<sup>3</sup>*, 79 = *IEleusis* 41) concerning the construction of a bridge across the *Rheitos* mentions priestesses carrying the *hiera*. These should be the two hierophantides, whose sculptural representations appear in the Lesser Propylaea at Eleusis.<sup>25</sup> The other major priestess of the *Mysteria*, the priestess of *Demeter and Kore*, surely would not be absent from such a procession, nor would the principal priests – the *hieropoioi*, *hierodouchos*, and sacred herald. A document of 170 (*IEleusis* 489 = *IG II<sup>2</sup>*, 1092) lists recipients of shares of an endowment established for the Eleusinian sanctuary:

- |    |   |                  |
|----|---|------------------|
| 45 | ιεροφάντης  | διπλῆν           |
|    | δαδοῦχος  | διπλῆν           |
|    | ἀρχιερεὺς   | διπλῆν           |
|    | ἐξηγητὴς  | διπλῆν           |
|    | ἐξηγηταὶ τρεῖς  | διπλᾶς           |
| 50 | ιεροκῆρυξ   | διπλῆν           |
|    | ἐπὶ βωμῶ  | διπλῆν           |
|    | Ἀθηνᾶς ἱέρεια   | διπλῆν           |
|    | Δήμητρος κ Κόρ  | διπλῆν           |
|    | ιεροφάντιδες δύο  | διπλᾶς           |
| 55 | ἱέρεια Καλ[...6...ἀπλῆν]                                | 66 ἀρχ[ων] E[ὕ]- |
|    | ἱέρεια Μοι[ρ...6...ἀπλ]ῆ(ν) μολπιδ(ῶν) ἀπ[λῆν]          |                  |
|    | καὶ ὅσοι π[αῖδες μυθθέν(τες)] <sup>ν</sup> ἀφ' ἐσ[τίας] |                  |
|    | φαιδυντῆς [ ἀπλῆν] <sup>νν</sup> [- - - - -]            |                  |
|    | Διὸς ἱερεὺς ἀπλῆν                                       | <i>vacat?</i> ]  |
| 60 | Ἰαχχαγωγὸς ἀπλῆν  | ]                |

22 See above, n. 13.

23 Clinton 1974, 96-7.

24 The separateness of the two processions is also reflected in *IG II<sup>2</sup>*, 1191 (= *IEleusis* 95.15-9) (1. τὰ ἱερά, 2. ἡ πανήγυρις τῶν Ἑλλήνων): ὁ[πω]ς τ[ὰ] ἱερά ἀσφαλῶς καὶ καλῶ[ς] πορε[ύ]ηται[ι] καὶ ἡ πανήγυρις τῶν ε[ἰσα]φι[κ]νο[ύ]μένων [Ε]λλήνων Ἐλευσ[ι]νάδε καὶ εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, [καὶ] οἱ τὸ προάστιον οἰκοῦν[τ]ε[ς] καὶ οἱ γεω[ρ]γοὶ σώζονται”.

25 Clinton 2004, 85-7.



Βουζύγη[ς ἀπλῆν ]  
 πυρφόρο[ς ἀπλῆν ]  
 παναγῆς ὧ[ ἀπλῆν ]  
 ἱερεὺς Θεοῦ[ καὶ Θεᾶς ἀπλῆν ]  
 65 ἱερεὺς Τριπτολέμου ἀπλῆν ]

Here we see in part a hierarchical list of sacred officials that looks very much like the order of a procession, and in this case the procession can only be the *pompe hama hierois*: hierophant, *dadouchos*, high priest (of the imperial cult), exegete (of unstated type), three exegetes (presumably of the Eumolpidai), sacred herald, altar-priest, priestess of Athena, priestess of Demeter and Kore, the two *hierophantides*, two priestesses (whose titles are not completely preserved), initiates from hearth, *phaidyntes*, priest of Zeus, Iakchagogos, Bouzyges, *pyrphoros*, *panages*, priest of the God and the Goddess, priest of Triptolemos, and archon of the Eumolpidai.<sup>26</sup> However, only the list down as far as the *hierophantides* (the first column) could probably represent the order of the procession of the *hieroi* (they are in fact the more important priests and they receive a double share of the endowment); the initiates from hearth and the Iakchagogos must of course belong to the March with Iakchos.

A notable exception to these dual processions was the procession organized by Alcibiades in 407 BC, who had the infantry provide an escort in order to put an end, if only temporarily, to the processions by sea, which had been necessitated by the Spartan occupation of Decelea and the passes to Eleusis. These processions by sea, as Plutarch noted (*Alc.* 34.3-7), lacked the “splendour” (*kosmos*) of the traditional ritual (*telete*) and omitted “also sacrifices and dances and many of the rites along the route

when they march out Iakchos”.<sup>27</sup> Plutarch clearly implies that a single procession took place on a single day because of the presence of hostile forces. It was prompted by Alcibiades’ desire to make a grand display, in response to the Athenians’ disappointment about the rites omitted during the sea voyages which had replaced the traditional Iakchos processions. Evidently the Athenians had been sending both the *hieroi* and the initiates to Eleusis in ships on the same day. Obviously circumstances could dictate flexibility in the arrangement and timing of the processions, and Alcibiades responded by reverting to the land route with the help of the army.

The terms “ἱεροφαντία καὶ μυσταγωγία” (*Alc.* 34.6), used by some observers of this procession, seem to reflect the unusual combination of the processions of the *hieroi* and of Iakchos, the term *hierophantia* suggesting that it consisted of the most important priests of the Mysteries led by the hierophant (as in the escort with the *hieroi*), the term *mystagogia* suggesting that it included the *mystai* with their *mystagogues*; that is, it combined both processions. The combination was necessary because it would have been impractical for the infantry, just as we saw in the case of the ephebes, to conduct processions from the asty on two days in a row: from the asty to Eleusis, then in the evening back to the asty, and the next morning back to Eleusis with Iakchos. (The *hieroi* in this time of warfare would have been kept in the City Eleusinion, not at Eleusis.) Plutarch’s description of the order of the participants – “ἱερεῖς καὶ μύσται καὶ μυσταγωγοί” – would also be consistent with “ἱεροφαντία καὶ μυσταγωγία”.<sup>28</sup> The ἱερεῖς would

27 *Alc.* 4: οὐδένα κόσμον εἶχεν ἡ τελετὴ πεμπομένη κατὰ θάλατταν, ἀλλὰ καὶ θυσίαι καὶ χορεῖαι καὶ πολλὰ τῶν δρωμένων καθ’ ὁδὸν ἱερῶν, ὅταν ἐξελαύνωσι τὸν Ἰακχον, ὅπ’ ἀνάγκης ἐξελείπετο.

28 *Alc.* 6: ἱερεῖς δὲ καὶ μύσται καὶ μυσταγωγοὺς ἀναλαβὼν καὶ τοῖς ὅπλοις περικαλύψας, ἤγεν ἐν κόσμῳ καὶ μετὰ σιωπῆς, θέαμα σεμνὸν καὶ θεοπρεπὲς τὴν στρατηγίαν ἐκείνην ἐπιδεικνύμενος, ὑπὸ τῶν μὴ φθονούντων ἱεροφαντίαν καὶ μυσταγωγίαν προσαγορευομένην.

belong to the Escort of the *Hiera* (here called *hierophantia*), the *μύσται καὶ μυσταγωγοί* to the *Iakchos* March (here called *mystagogia*). Alcibiades led them in good order and silence, Plutarch said. This was a significant change from the style of the *Iakchos* March, which on this occasion would have lacked much of its Dionysiac character; thus the term *mystagogia* would be more appropriate. If they made the entire journey in silence, one wonders about the sacrifices and dances and other rites that were omitted when the procession had gone by sea, i.e. whether they were now also omitted during Alcibiades' military escort; the silence suggests omission, unless the omission was restricted to a critical point of the journey, namely the march over Mount Aigaleos, where the threat from a hostile force would be most serious.

In conclusion, there were normally two processions from central Athens to Eleusis at the *Mysteria*, the Escort of the *Hiera* on Boedromion 19 and the *Iakchos* March on the next day; this satisfies the evidence for the two dates and the implication in Hellenistic decrees that the *hiera* were conveyed in a separate procession, preceding the procession with *Iakchos*.<sup>29</sup> However, in times of emergency, the processions could take place on the same day, with the *hiera* preceding the initiates and *mystagogues*. This recognition brings us closer to the religious atmosphere of the festival. The Escort of the *Hiera* was an august affair, an ancestral tradition, conducted with the great dignity that can be bestowed by a military escort; it was accompanied by sacrifices, libations, and paeans, and comprised the hierophant and major priests and priestesses of the *Mysteria*. The *Iakchos* March, on the other hand, included the initiates and their *mystagogues*, led by the initiates'

divine spirit, *Iakchos*, the god of many hymns. It was the *panegyris* of the Hellenes, raising an enormous cloud of dust as they marched, singing the *Iakchos* song. It too was accompanied by sacrifices, and also by dances, as Plutarch noted. Unlike the solemn *pompe* of the *hiera*, it was a Dionysiac affair.

## Appendix

### *The Procession at the Andanian Mysteria*

A comparison of the Eleusinian procession with the one at the Andanian *Mysteria* helps to shed light on the roles of processions in both festivals, especially since the Andanian one is a well-described procession in a mystery cult, in legislation called *diagramma* (IG V,1 1390.28-34):<sup>30</sup>

ἐν δὲ ταῖς πομπαῖς ἀγείστω Μνασίστρατος, ὁ ἱερεὺς τῶν θεῶν, οἷς /(29) τὰ μυστήρια γίνονται, μετὰ τὰς ἱερέας, ἔπειτα ἀγωνοθέτας, ἱεροθύται, οἱ αὐληταί· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα αἱ παρθέναι αἱ ἱεραί, καθὼς ἂν λά/(30)χωντι, ἄγουσαι τὰ ἄρματα ἐπικειμένους κίστας ἐχούσας ἱερὰ μυστικά· εἶπεν ἂ θοιναρμόστρια ἂ εἰς Δάματρος καὶ αἱ ὑποθοίναρ/(31)μόστρια αἱ ἐμβεβακυῖαι, εἶπεν ἂ ἱερεῖα τὰς Δάματρος τὰς ἐφ' ἵπποδρόμῳ, εἶπεν ἂ τὰς ἐν Αἰγίλῃ· ἔπειτα αἱ ἱεραὶ κατὰ μίαν, κα/(32)θὼς κα λάχωντι, ἔπειτα οἱ ἱεροί, καθὼς κα οἱ δέκα διατάξωντι. ὁ δὲ γυναικονόμος κλαροῦτω τὰς τε ἱεράς καὶ παρθένους καὶ ἐπιμέλειαν /(33) ἔχέτω, ὅπως πομπεύωντι, καθὼς κα λάχωντι. ἀγέσθω δὲ ἐν ταῖς πομπαῖς καὶ τὰ θύματα, καὶ θυσάντω ταῖς μὲν Δάματρι σὺν ἐπίτοκα, Ἑρμᾷ/(34) νι κριόν, Μεγάλοις Θεοῖς δάμαλιν σὺν, Ἀπόλλωνι Καρνεῖω κάπρον, Ἄγναι οἶν.

Concerning the Procession: In the procession *Mnasistratos* must lead, then the priest of the gods for whom the *Mysteria* are celebrated in company with

29 The arrangement made good sense administratively; having each procession on a separate day facilitated organization, considering how difficult it can be to organize a major procession, and it allowed each procession's distinct character to be the focus of the day.

30 The text is that of Gawlinski 2012, 70, 72.



the priestess, then the *agonothetes*, the *hierothytai*, and the *auletai*. And after those, the sacred virgins, as allotted, leading the chariots with a *kista* set upon them containing the *hiera mystika*. Then the *thoinarmostria* for (the sanctuary) of Demeter, and the assistant *thoinarmostriai* who are mounted (on them), then the priestess of Demeter at the Hippodrome, and then the priestess of Demeter in Aigila. Then the sacred women, one by one, as allotted, then the sacred men, as the Ten Men arrange them. The *gynaikonomos* must allot the places of the sacred women and virgins and is to see that they process as they were allotted. The sacrificial animals are also to be led in the procession, and they must sacrifice a pregnant sow to Demeter, a ram to Hermes, a young pig to the Great Gods, a boar to Apollo Karneios, and a sheep to Hagna.<sup>31</sup>

Laura Gawlinski (and, so far as I know, all other commentators) understood the procession to be the one that escorted the *hiera* from Messene to the sanctuary called Karneiasion in Andania.<sup>32</sup> A different interpretation now seems to me more likely.<sup>33</sup>

Some regulations in the Messenian *diagramma* are similar to those in the fragmentary decree IEleusis 250 (above, pp. 166-7). The participants are placed with precision; the sacred women and men are ordered to remain in their allotted positions, with special concern expressed about the behaviour of the sacred women (the *gynaikonomos* is to take care that they process according to their allotted order). There is a hierarchy, as we saw in the (probable) order of the Eleusinian Escort of the *Hiera* (IEleusis 489, above, p. 168). In the Andanian law it is precisely stated: 1) Mnasiistratos; 2) the priest and priestess of the Mysteria; 3) the officials associated

with the sacrifice (*agonothetes*, *hierothytai*, *auletai*);<sup>34</sup> 4) the sacred virgins leading the *hiera*; 5) the banquet mistress of Demeter, her assistants, two priestesses of Demeter;<sup>35</sup> 6) sacred women; 7) sacred men. The animals follow, as well as the command to sacrifice them and to which gods.

However, there is no mention of initiates and their mystagogues.<sup>36</sup> Thus the Andanian procession, at first glance, is more like the Eleusinian Escort of the *Hiera* (rather than the march [*elasis*] of the initiates from central Athens to Eleusis as described in IEleusis 250, above pp. 166-7). If this is the case, and the procession began in Messene, it is odd that the place from which the *hiera* are fetched is not mentioned, as it is in the Eleusinian document (IEleusis 638, above, p. 162).

There is a further major difference between the Eleusinian and Andanian escorts (*pompai*). At the tail end of the Andanian procession, the sacrificial animals are listed (a position that ensures the participants will not be forced to step on the animals' excrement), and the officials in charge of the sacrifice appear in the third section, close to the front of the procession. What is clear about this procession

31 Trans. Gawlinski 2012, 71, 73, except for "αὶ ἐμπεβακυῖαι" (31).

32 Gawlinski 2012, 30; Deshours 2006, 119-20.

33 It occurred to me at this time as I closely studied details of the procession and related ritual (oaths and sacrifices) in preparing this article.

34 The connection of the *agonothetes* with sacrifice is noted by Gawlinski 2012, 138 n. 169, with reference to Winand 1990, 179. See also Wörrle 1988, 190 on the sacrificial functions of the *agonothetes* of the Demostheneia at Oinoanda and *agonothetai* elsewhere.

35 This fifth group consists of sacred officials of Demeter, the first with duties at the banquet, and we can hypothetically assume that all these sacred officials of Demeter had to do with the banquet. Demeter's special status at the festival is reflected in her primary position at the sacrifice preceding the Sacred Meal, noted by Gawlinski 2012, 19. On Demeter and her priestesses at Messene, see Deshours 2006, 124-5, 188-9, 204-5, 226-33; Gawlinski 2012, 19-21, 141-2.

36 At the Eleusinian Mysteria the initiates and mystagogues journeyed in a march (*elasis*) to Eleusis, discussed above, pp. 167-8; such a march could have been described on a missing stele of the *diagramma*. On the existence of a preceding stele, see Gawlinski 2012, 2, 61.

therefore is that it belongs to the category of processions that lead to a sacrifice followed by a meal, in this instance a major sacrifice and a “sacred” meal. It was a “Sacrificial Procession”, *Opferzug* in Martin P. Nilsson’s terminology.<sup>37</sup> This is confirmed by the section on the Sacred Seal (lines 95-9):<sup>38</sup>

Concerning the Sacred Meal: The Sacred Men, after removing the customary portions for the gods from each of the sacrificial victims led in the procession, must use the rest of the meat for the sacred meal, with the Sacred Women and Virgins, and they must invite the Priest and the Priestess and the Priestess of Karneios (ἱέρειαν τοῦ Καρνείου) and Mnasistratos and both his wife and his children and those artists who served in the dances and those serving as their helpers. And for the rest of the expenses they must make no greater expenditure than [blank] drachmas.<sup>39</sup>

The fact that it is a procession leading to a sacrifice and meal is not decisive in determining when it took place; however, the aorist participle indicates that the dances have already been performed, and therefore the procession, sacrifice, and sacred meal took place toward the end of the festival. It remains

to be determined whether other information in the *diagramma* is in harmony with this inference.

The section entitled “Concerning the Supplying of Sacrificial Animals” states (lines 64-5):

After their appointment the Sacred Men, having made an announcement in advance, are to contract out the supplying of sacrificial animals, which must be sacrificed and presented in the Mysteries (θύεσθαι καὶ παρίστασθαι ἐν τοῖς μυστηρίοις).

The animals are to be presented twice, as the text goes on to explain (lines 69-72):

And the contractor, having provided guarantors to the Sacred Men, must take the funds and present very holy, pure, whole animals and show (ἐπιδειξάτω) them to the Sacred Men **ten days** before the Mysteries. The Sacred Men are to put a mark on those approved (τοῖς δοκιμασθέντοις), and the contractor must present (προστίτω) the marked ones. If he does not present (προστίτω) for the scrutiny (μὴ περιστῇ ἐπὶ τὰν δοκιμασθέντων), the Sacred Men must exact from the guarantors the amount plus half, and they themselves must supply the animals and from the exacted funds recover the resulting expenditure for the animals.<sup>40</sup>

The first presentation of the animals by the contractor was for a *dokimasia*, to take place 10 days before the Mysteries; the second was the presentation of the approved animals at a (second) *dokimasia* “in the Mysteries” (line 65). This raises the question about the start date of the festival.

We have no explicit information about the start date of the Andanian Mysteries, i.e. whether, like the Eleusinian Mysteries, the festival started before the initiates arrived at the sanctuary, where the main ritual took place. However, the very beginning of this stele of the *diagramma* states: “The Secretary of the *Synedroi* must administer the oath written below

37 Nilsson 1916, 311-2. This is his type II (*Götterzug*), 1 (*Zug zum Gott*) a (*Opferzug*). He does not include it under type II, 1, c (*Zug, der die Verbindung zweier Kultstätten ausdrückt*), to which he assigns the “Iakchoszug”, presumably because he found no indication in the Andanian *diagramma* for such a connection.

38 To my knowledge, this is the only example of a post-sacrifice meal (δειπνον) which is qualified as ἱερόν. This qualification may indicate that the participants of the meal are celebrants of the cult (in the case of the most prestigious celebrant, Mnasistratos, his family is also included). Such a meal seems to be alluded to in IG V,2 269:22-4, at Mantinea: “καλεῖν δὲ αὐτὴν κα[ὶ] ἐπὶ τὰ γέρα δι’ αἰῶνος καὶ τοὺς ἐγγόνους αὐτῆς, καθ’ ὃ ἄν δειπνῶσι οἱ ἱερεῖς”.

39 Trans. Gawlinski 2012, 85, 87, except for the phrase in lines 97-8: “τῶν τεχνιτῶν τοὺς λει[τουργή]σαντας [ἐν τα]ῖς χορείαις”.

40 Trans. Gawlinski 2012, 79, 81.



immediately, unless someone is ill, while they pour blood and wine as the sacrifices are burning" ("[ἐπὶ τῷ καίοντων, lines 1-2). After these instructions, it goes on to state (line 7): "The Priest and the Sacred Men should administer the same oath to the Sacred Women in the sanctuary of Karneios [ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Καρνείου] on the day before the Mysteria."<sup>41</sup> It was especially urgent that the oaths of the men be administered immediately after their selection, obviously because the *diagramma* was issued very close to the start of the Mysteria. In the following year ("the 55th"), i.e. a normal year, the sacred men and women simply swear the oath in the eleventh month, before the Mysteria, for in this next year there will obviously be no special urgency, and nothing is said about the necessity of the women taking the oath in the sanctuary of Karneios (lines 10-1). If the sanctuary of Karneios is the Karneiasion (the term used elsewhere in the document), then the women took this oath, in the current year when the legislation occurred, in the Andanian sanctuary on the day before the Mysteria, not as in the following year, in the eleventh month on some unspecified day before the Mysteria (after the sacred men had sworn) at a venue that did not need to be specified.

We must next consider whether the sanctuary of Karneios (or Karneion) in question was located in Messene. In the current year, "immediately" (upon the selection of the sacred men), the sacred men took the same oath as the women (except for an appendix contained in the women's oath), "as the sacrifices are burning". The precise location is not mentioned; the most convenient one would presumably be somewhere in the city of Messene. As it was a matter of such urgency that immediately upon the allotment of the sacred men the secretary of the *synedroi* had to administer the oath, there seems to be no reason why it could not be administered in the very place where the *synedroi* met, issued the *diagramma*, and conducted the allotment of the sacred men – the

*synedrion*, the Messenian Council.<sup>42</sup> Since the oath took place more than 10 days before the start of the festival, that is, before the sacred men had time to advertise and conclude a contract (or contracts) for the animals to be presented at a *dokimasia* on the tenth day before the Mysteria (line 70), we should not expect the sacred men to be in Andania at this early point.

The oath taken by the women (surely also as sacrifices were burning)<sup>43</sup> must be taken "in the sanctuary of Karneios on the day before the Mysteria". If the sanctuary of Karneios were in the city, surely it would also be the appropriate venue for the oath of the sacred men. But since the men were not required to take their oath in this sanctuary, this fact tends to confirm that the venue for the women's oath was not a Karneion in the city, but the sanctuary of Karneios at Andania, also called simply Karneiasion. If a woman failed to take the oath, she was not replaced, like a man who refused, but was fined 1000 drachmas and prohibited from celebrating the rituals at sacrifices (which started even before the festival began) and from taking part in the Mysteria (lines 8-10). Fundamentally, neither the selected sacred men nor the selected sacred women could undertake their official activities before taking their respective oaths, activities that would include the *pompa* leading to the sacrifice. Both the sacred men (administering the oath) and the women (taking the oath) had to be in the sanctuary on the day before the start of the Mysteria. It was therefore impossible for the *pompa* to have taken place before the eve of the Mysteria.

These details concerning the venues and times of the oath-taking of the sacred men and women suggest that the Messenian participants (and others) in the Mysteria arrived at the Karneiasion before

42 On the functions of the *synedroi* of Messene and the location of the *Synedrion*, see Deshours 2004, 136-9.

43 Although this is not mentioned, it is implied by the command to take "the same oath," line 8.

the festival began, on the preceding day or, if they wished, even earlier. Since the procession, sacrifice, and sacred meal took place “in the Mysteria”, these events had to take place after the start of the festival at the sanctuary, theoretically even on the first day.<sup>44</sup> However, in that case the procession could not have been one that went from Messene to the Andanian sanctuary, because the sacred men and all the sacred women present in Andania on the eve of the festival for the oath would have had to travel c. 17 kilometres back to Messene on the day before the Mysteria and then repeat the same trip of c. 17 kilometres in a procession back to the sanctuary on the following day, the first day of the Mysteria – a total of c. 34 kilometres of travelling over two days. This of course is highly unlikely. However, we cannot exclude the possibility that there was an *elasis* from Messene to the sanctuary before the start of the Mysteria, like the Iakchos march from central Athens to Eleusis; such an *elasis* could have been described on a preceding stele.<sup>45</sup>

At the Eleusinian Mysteria, the main sacrifices at the Eleusinian sanctuary most probably took place on the day after the secret ritual within the sanctuary.<sup>46</sup> At Andania, if there is significance in the rather early placement of the procession and sacrifice on this stele of the *diagramma* (lines 28-34, following some early events and issues), it might suggest that they took place early on. Thus if the position of the description of the procession in the *diagramma* has significance, it could have been one of the opening events of the festival (although any such significance is diminished by the fact that the beginning of the *diagramma* most probably occurred on another

stele).<sup>47</sup> As an opening event, the procession would have celebrated the introduction of the *hiera* contained in (evidently more than one) *kista*, mounted on chariots led by the sacred maidens, and the presentation of the principal sacred officials of the Mysteria – Mnasiistratos, priest and priestess, those in charge of the sacrifice and sacred meal (*agonothetes*, *hierothytai*, *auletai*, *thoinarmostriai*, priestesses of Demeter), sacred women and men, and performing artists. It culminated in a sacred meal for the procession’s participants and the priestess of Karneios (invited because it was her sanctuary, but she did not take part in the procession because it was not the festival of Karneios).<sup>48</sup> Thus it could have been a relatively short procession honoring this important group and the *hiera*.

However, what seems to be more significant than the early placement of the description of the procession within the *diagramma* is the chronological order in the delivery of the sacrificial and purificatory animals, which must be “presented in the Mysteria” (lines 67-9):

ἔστι δὲ ἃ δεῖ παρέχειν, πρὸ τοῦ ἄρχεσθαι τῶν  
μυστηρίων, ἄρνας δύο λευκοὺς, ἐπὶ τοῦ καθαρμοῦ  
κρίον εὐχρουν, καί, ὅταν /(68) ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ  
καθαίρει, χοιρίσκους τρεῖς, ὑπὲρ τοὺς πρωτομύστας  
ἄρνας ἑκατόν, ἐν δὲ ταῖς πομπαῖς Δάματρι σὺν ἐπίτοκα,  
τοῖς δὲ Μεγάλοις /(69) Θεοῖς δάμαλιν διετὴ σὺν,  
Ἑρμᾶνι κρίον, Ἀπόλλωνι Καρνείῳ κάπρον, Ἄγναι οἶν.

This appears to be in chronological order: 1) “before the beginning of the Mysteria”, two white lambs; 2) “at the time of [ἐπὶ] the purification” (which we

44 This would be true of the sacrifice if there were a procession from Messene to the sanctuary, as Gawlinski 2012, 206 logically pointed out.

45 See n. 36 above. The women who had been selected to serve as sacred women presumably would not have to perform official duties during such a march.

46 See Clinton 1988, esp. 70-1.

47 On the question of a missing stele, see n. 36 above.

48 The other participants in the procession – *agonothetes*, *hierothytai*, *auletai*, *thoinarmostriai*, priestesses of Demeter – were not mentioned as participants in the Sacred Meal, presumably because, as they were involved with the sacrifice and the organization and preparation of the Sacred Meal (see p. 172 above), it was understood that they would participate in the meal itself.



would expect at the beginning), a ram of good complexion;<sup>49</sup> 3) “when one purifies in the theatre”, three piglets;<sup>50</sup> 4) “on behalf of the first-time initiates”, 100 lambs; 5) “in the procession”, the animals for the sacrifice and sacred meal (above, p. 18). For each of the first three deliveries, a time is specified. It seems most natural to understand the last two deliveries in the same way: they took place toward the end of the festival, after the completion of the mystic rites. 100 lambs could have fed several hundred people; “ὑπέρ”, undoubtedly meaning “on behalf of”, need not mean that the sharing of the meat was limited to the initiates themselves.

Finally, as noted earlier (p. 172), in the section on the sacred meal, the last participants listed are the sacred artists and their assistants (lines 97-8): “τῶν τεχνιτῶν τοὺς λει[τουργή]σαντας [ἐν τα]ῖς χορείαις καὶ τῶν ὑπηρεσιῶν τοὺς λειτουργοῦντας αὐτοῖς”. Here, the aorist participle indicates antecedent action, as so often in qualifying an already completed office or liturgy in inscriptions: “those artists who served in the dances and those serving as their helpers”.<sup>51</sup> The dances have already taken place; the sacred meal occurred at a later point in the festival.

Thus the sacrifices and sacred meal took place after the performance of the artists, which most likely took place at a central point in the festival, and this order, as has been shown, is consistent with all other information in the *diagramma*, including the order of delivering the sacrificial victims, with the 100 lambs “for the sake of the first-time initiates” and those for the sacred meal delivered at the end.<sup>52</sup>

Sacrifice towards the end of the festival would parallel the order at Eleusis, with the great sacrifices and sacrificial feasts taking place after the mystic rites.

We could imagine that while the leading sacred officials, including members of Mnasiistratos’ family, enjoyed a sacred meal, the initiates and their families (and presumably others) participated in the feast provided by 100 lambs sacrificed “for the sake of the initiates”, preceded by its own very simple procession. At any rate, the *diagramma* ought to have contained information about this other significant sacrifice (it would have entailed expenditures); it is hard to imagine that it was not described on the missing stele, along with other information concerning first-time initiates and other participants in the festival. As Gawlinski noted, sacrifices formed a major part of the festival, “evidenced by the repeated linking of ‘αἱ θυσίαι καὶ τὰ μυστήρια’ (lines 9-10, 39, 74, 75, 85-86, 183-184), phrasing which shows that a distinction was seen between the rituals of *thysia* and *mysteria*”.<sup>53</sup> Given the prominence of the sacrifices, we are left to assume that there was a further description of the sacrifice for the initiates on the missing stele.

At Eleusis too there must have been a procession at the time of the major sacrifices that provided a meal for the entire festive throng. Though such a procession is not specifically attested, it is to be expected – a local procession leading to the sacrifice, when the ephebes, who took part in this (short) procession, lifted the sacrificial bulls for the slaughter,<sup>54</sup> followed by the participants’ meal.

The precise route of the Andanian *pompa* is not specified in the *diagramma*, presumably because it was a traditional one known to all. The presence of the *hiera* would suggest that it terminated near

<sup>49</sup> On such a purification ritual at Delos and elsewhere, see Clinton 2005, 172-3.

<sup>50</sup> On this type of purification, see Gawlinski 2012, 170; Clinton 2005, 169-70; Parker 1981, 21.

<sup>51</sup> Gawlinski 2012, 85 translated the participle with the English present participle (“serving”); Deshours 2006, 39 with the French future perfect (“auront joué”). Neither can be correct here.

<sup>52</sup> On the importance of dancing and music during initiations in mystery cult, see Gawlinski 2012, 177-8.

<sup>53</sup> Gawlinski 2012, 165.

<sup>54</sup> See Clinton 1988. Sometimes the ephebes slaughtered the animals ἐν τῷ περιβόλῳ τοῦ ἱεροῦ (IG II<sup>2</sup>, 1028.11), but the altars on which they were sacrificed and the *escharai* on which the meat was cooked were located in front of the sanctuary.

where the *hiera* would be housed until the next festival, perhaps in the Temple of the Great Gods or the Oikos. The procession may have started at the place where the *hiera* were displayed in the ritual.

In conclusion, the following seems to be the general order of the festival:

- 1) The participants, initiates and others, arrived in the sanctuary by the day before the start of the festival and set up their tents. (There was no formal *pompa* from Messene to the Karnaseion.)<sup>55</sup> Presumably on this day the two white lambs were sacrificed.
- 2) The festival began on the next day, and the sanctuary was purified with the sacrifice of "a ram of good complexion".
- 3) A major part of the ritual took place in the theatre, which was purified with three piglets.
- 4) *Pompa* and sacred meal. In addition, probably at this time 100 lambs were sacrificed "on behalf of the first-time initiates", followed by a meal for the first-time initiates and other participants.

## Abbreviations

*IEleusis* = K. Clinton, *Eleusis. The Inscriptions on Stone. Documents of the Sanctuary of the Two Goddesses and the Public Documents of the Deme* 1 (2005), 2 (2008).

*IG* = *Inscriptiones Graecae* (1873-)

*SEG* = *Supplementum epigraphicum Graecum* (1923-)

## Bibliography

ALESHIRE, S.B. 1991

*Asklepios at Athens: Epigraphic and Prosopographic Essays on the Athenian Healing Cults*, Amsterdam.

CLINTON, K. 1974

*The Sacred Officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries*, Philadelphia.

CLINTON, K. 1988

'Sacrifice at the Eleusinian Mysteries', in *Early Greek Cult Practice*, R. Hägg & N. Marinatos (eds.), Stockholm, 69-79.

CLINTON, K. 1992

*Myth and Cult. The Iconography of the Eleusinian Mysteries. The Martin P. Nilsson Lectures on Greek Religion, Delivered 19-21 November 1990 at the Swedish Institute in Athens*, Stockholm.

CLINTON, K. 2004

'Epiphany in the Eleusinian Mysteries', *Illinois Classical Studies* 29, 85-109.

CLINTON, K. 2005

'The Eleusinian Mysteries', in *Greek Sacrificial Ritual, Olympian and Chthonian*, R. Hägg & B. Alroth (eds.), Stockholm, 167-79.

DESHOURS, N. 2004

'Les institutions civiques de Messène à l'époque hellénistique tardive', *ZPE* 150, 134-46.

DESHOURS, N. 2006

*Les mystères d'Andania: étude d'épigraphie et d'histoire religieuse*, Bordeaux.

FOLLET, S. 1976

*Athènes au II<sup>e</sup> et au III<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Paris.

FOUCART, P. 1914

*Les Mystères d'Éleusis*, Paris.

GAWLINSKI, L. 2012

*The Sacred Law of Andania: A New Text with Commentary*, Berlin.



GRAF, F. 1996

'*Pompai* in Greece: Some Considerations about Space and Ritual in the Greek Polis', in *The Role of Religion in the Early Greek Polis*, R. Hägg (ed.), Stockholm, 55-65.

MYLONAS, G.E. 1961

*Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*, 1961.

NILSSON, M.P. 1916

'Die Prozessionstypen im griechischen Kult', *Jdl* 31, 309-39.

OLIVER, J.H. 1949

'Two Athenian Poets', *Hesperia Suppl.* 8, 243-58.

PARKER, R. 1981

*Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*, Oxford.

PARKER, R. 2005

*Polytheism and Society at Athens*, Oxford.

WINAND, J. 1990

*Les hiérothytes: recherche institutionnelle*, Brussels.

WÖRRLE, M. 1988

*Stadt und Fest im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien*, Munich.